

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-0394V

(not to be published)

ANASTACIA SALCEDO,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: June 10, 2022

Special Processing Unit (SPU);  
Attorney's Fees and Costs

*Michael G. McLaren, Black McLaren Jones Ryland & Griffee, P.C., Memphis, TN, for Petitioner.*

*Kyle Edward Pozza, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.*

### **DECISION ON ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS<sup>1</sup>**

On April 6, 2020, Anastacia Salcedo filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioner alleges that she received an influenza vaccine on October 23, 2018, and thereafter suffered a right-sided shoulder injury related to vaccine administration. (Petition at 1). On January 10, 2022, a decision was issued awarding compensation to Petitioner based on the Respondent's proffer. (ECF No. 36).

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished Decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

Petitioner has now filed a motion for attorney's fees and costs, dated April 19, 2022 (ECF No. 41), requesting a total award of \$45,317.56 (representing \$42,624.80 in fees and \$2,692.76 in costs). In accordance with General Order No. 9, Petitioner has also filed a signed statement indicating that she incurred no out-of-pocket expenses. (ECF No. 41-3). Respondent did not file a response.

### **ANALYSIS**

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs. Section 15(e). Counsel must submit fee requests that include contemporaneous and specific billing records indicating the service performed, the number of hours expended on the service, and the name of the person performing the service. See *Savin v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 85 Fed. Cl. 313, 316-18 (2008). Counsel should not include in their fee requests hours that are "excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary." *Saxton v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 3 F.3d 1517, 1521 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (quoting *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 434 (1983)). It is "well within the special master's discretion to reduce the hours to a number that, in [her] experience and judgment, [is] reasonable for the work done." *Id.* at 1522. Furthermore, the special master may reduce a fee request *sua sponte*, apart from objections raised by respondent and without providing a petitioner notice and opportunity to respond. See *Sabella v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 86 Fed. Cl. 201, 209 (2009). A special master need not engage in a line-by-line analysis of petitioner's fee application when reducing fees. *Broekelschen v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 102 Fed. Cl. 719, 729 (2011).

The petitioner "bears the burden of establishing the hours expended, the rates charged, and the expenses incurred." *Wasson v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 24 Cl. Ct. 482, 484 (1991). The Petitioner "should present adequate proof [of the attorney's fees and costs sought] at the time of the submission." *Wasson*, 24 Cl. Ct. at 484 n.1. Petitioner's counsel "should make a good faith effort to exclude from a fee request hours that are excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary, just as a lawyer in private practice ethically is obligated to exclude such hours from his fee submission." *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 434.

### **ATTORNEY FEES**

Petitioner requests compensation for attorney Michael McLaren and Christopher Webb the following rates:

	2019	2020	2021	2022
Michael McLaren	\$464	\$484	X	\$501
Christopher Webb	\$338	\$351	\$364	\$395

(ECF No. 41 at 8).

The requested rates for time billed between 2019-21 are reasonable and consistent with what has previously been awarded for work these attorneys have performed for other petitioners. In addition, the requested increases for 2022 are appropriate and will be awarded.

Petitioner also requests the rate of \$355 per hour for time billed by law clerks in 2022. (Id). Although the detailed billing records show that no time was billed at this rate by any law clerks, it is considered excessive for a non-barred student. In future, if time should be billed at this rate for law clerks, it shall be reduced to the appropriate rate of a paralegal.

### **ATTORNEY COSTS**

Petitioner requests \$2,692.76 in overall costs. (ECF No. 41 at 1). This amount is comprised of obtaining medical records, travel costs and the Court's filing fee. I have reviewed all of the requested costs and find them to be reasonable and shall award them in full.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs. Section 15(e). Accordingly, I hereby GRANT Petitioner's Motion for attorney's fees and costs. I award a total of **\$45,317.56** (representing \$42,624.80 in fees and \$2,692.76 in costs) as a lump sum in the form of a check jointly payable to Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel. In the absence of a timely-filed motion for review (see Appendix B to the Rules of the Court), the Clerk shall enter judgment in accordance with this Decision.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties may expedite entry of judgment by filing a joint notice renouncing their right to seek review.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran  
Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master